

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44*bis*)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 8567PCT/GDM	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2004/030002	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 13 September 2004 (13.09.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 15 September 2003 (15.09.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant POLAROID CORPORATION		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 80%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44 <i>bis</i> .3(c) and 93 <i>bis</i> .1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 16 March 2006 (16.03.2006)
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Beate Giffo-Schmitt</div>
Telephone No. +41 22 338 87 20	

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY Corrected Version

REC'D 06 DEC 2004

PCT PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2004/030002

International filing date (day/month/year)
13.09.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
15.09.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04N5/235, G03B15/05

Applicant
POLAROID CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Schinnerl, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8609



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/030002

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2004/030002

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	2-11,13-16
	No: Claims	1,12
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-16
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

- 1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1 : US-A-6 081 076 (OGAWA KIMIAKI) 27 June 2000 (2000-06-27)
D2 : US 2002/081111 A1 (INA HIROHIKO ET AL) 27 June 2002 (2002-06-27)
D3 : US-A-4 941 011 (FARRINGTON DAVID L) 10 July 1990 (1990-07-10)

- 2 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1 and 12 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses (the references in parenthesis applying to this document):

An electronic camera (column 8, line 24 - column 9, line 32; figure 1), comprising:
 an electronic image capture device adapted for capturing an image scene (column 8, lines 33-42; figure 1);
 a scanning aperture shutter located to control light energy received by said electronic image capture device from said image scene (column 8, lines 33-42; figure 1);
 a photocell adapted for sensing light energy received from said image scene (column 8, lines 63 - column 9, line 32; figure 1); and
 an exposure control system responsive to said photocell and operatively connected to said scanning aperture shutter (column 8, lines 63 - column 9, line 32; figure 1),
 wherein said exposure control system is adapted to control said scanning aperture shutter and a flash unit in response to sensed light energy at said photocell to control an amount of fill flash energy received by said electronic image capture system in relation to ambient light energy received by said electronic image capture system during image capture (column 13, line 10 - column 14, line 37; figure 6).

Therefore, the subject-matter of claim 1 lacks novelty.

This objection applies equally to the closely related method claim 12.

It is noted that the subject-matter of the independent claims 1 and 12 also lacks novelty having regard to D2 (see page 3, paragraph 0045 and page 7, paragraphs 0066-0068; figure 1).

- 3 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 2-11 and 13-16 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
- 3.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (see point 2 of this written opinion) a camera from which the subject-matter of the independent claim 8 differs in that the flash unit is extinguished when a predetermined amount of infrared energy is sensed by the photocell.

This feature is described in document D3 (column 6, line 55 - column 7, line 53; figures 1-3) as providing the same advantages as in the present application. The skilled person would therefore regard it as a normal option to include this feature in the camera described in document D1 in order to solve the problem of more reliably detecting the reflected amount of flash light.

- 3.2 Dependent claims 2-7, 9-11 and 13-16 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT) because these claims concern commonplace features which are either derivable from the documents cited in the International Search Report (eg claim 2-5, 9, 10 and 13-16: D3, column 6, line 55 - column 7, line 53; figures 1-3) or obvious to a skilled person.

- 4 Industrial applicability is given in the technical field of electronic cameras.

Re Item VII

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2004/030002

- 1 Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1-D3 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.
- 2 The independent claims are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the closest prior art being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).

If, however, the applicant is of the opinion that the two-part form would be inappropriate, then reasons therefor should be provided in the letter of reply. In addition, the applicant should ensure that it is clear from the description which features of the subject-matter of the independent claims are already known in combination from the document D1 (see the PCT Guidelines, III-2.3a).
- 3 The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).

Re Item VIII

Although claims 1 and 8 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.